

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-20 remain in this application. Claims 1 and 17 have been amended. Support for amended claims 1 and 17 can be found, for example, in Applicant's specification, page 5, lines 4-6, and in FIGS. 1 and 3.

1. § 102 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9-12 and 15-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Bruno (2335041).

Applicant submits that this rejection is traversed in view of amended claims 1 and 17. These claims recite that a first inner terminal is disposed within the unitary body, "the inner terminal comprising a first portion and a second portion, the first portion extending along the first axis disposed within the first bore and contacting the inner surface of the tubular portion of the body, and the second portion extending along the second axis disposed within the second bore, said second portion defining an integral angled node." (emphasis added) This recitation is neither taught nor suggested by Bruno. Specifically, Bruno does not teach or suggest an inner terminal having first and second portions that extend along different axes, the second portion defining an integral angled node. Instead, Bruno teaches two straight contact pins, 6 and 13, that each individually extend along only a single axis (see, e.g., Bruno FIG. 1). Bruno then emphasizes that the two straight contact pins should be soldered together (see, e.g., Bruno, col. 2, ll. 8-9; *see also* Bruno col. 2, ll. 17-20). Given this emphasis on soldering straight contact pins, persons of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to modify the teachings of Bruno in order to provide for the integral angled node of Applicant's claimed invention.

2. § 103 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bruno. The Examiner has rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bruno in view of Thommen (4881912). The Examiner has

Appl No.: 10/572198
Response dated: September 18, 2008
Office Action dated: July 17, 2008

rejected claims 13 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bruno in view of Brishka (3432798).

Claims 5, 8, 13 and 14 are dependant on claim 1 and are therefore patentable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to that claim.

Based upon the above amendments, remarks, and papers of records, applicant believes the pending claims of the above-captioned application are in allowable form and patentable over the prior art of record. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Applicant believes that no extension of time is necessary to make this Reply timely. Should applicant be in error, applicant respectfully requests that the Office grant such time extension pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) as necessary to make this Reply timely, and hereby authorizes the Office to charge any necessary fee or surcharge with respect to said time extension to the deposit account of the undersigned firm of attorneys, Deposit Account 03-3325.

Please direct any questions or comments to Matthew J. Mason at 607-974-9993.

Date: 9-18-08

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION
I hereby certify that this paper and/or fee or charge authorization is being transmitted to Mail Stop RCE, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on September 18, 2008, via:

- ☐ Express Mail Post Office to Addressee service of the United States Postal Service under 37 CFR §1.10 (Express Mail Label No. _____);
- ☐ depositing with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail under 37 CFR §1.8;
- ☐ Facsimile Transmission under 37 CFR §1.6(d) (Facsimile No. _____);
- ☒ the Electronic Filing System of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office under 37 CFR §1.6(a)(4).

Signature


Matthew J. Mason

Respectfully submitted,
CORNING INCORPORATED



Matthew J. Mason
Registration No. 44,904
Corning Incorporated
Intellectual Property Department
Mail Stop SP-TI-03-1
Corning, NY 14831
607-974-9993